INTERNATIONAL MULTIFOODS
MULTIFOODS TOWER
BOX 2942
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55402



June 20, 1988

Mr. Edward Kowalski, 5HR-11 U.S. EPA - REGION 5 Office of Regional Counsel 230 South Dearborn Street Chicago, IL 60604

RE: NINTH AVENUE DUMP, GARY, INDIANA U.S. SCRAP, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Dear Mr. Kowalski:

As you may recall, I had a telephone conversation with you on or about June 16 regarding the above referenced sites. You stated that you would review the evidence which your office has gathered in light of Steve Martell's statement to determine whether some of the potentially responsible parties on your list would be removed from said list. We reviewed briefly the alleged link between International Multifoods and the sites. As I explained to you at that time, my internal investigation has uncovered no documentation which falls within the scope of your original information request. A response to that information request, dated April 5, 1988, was directed to Ms. Susan Swales of your office.

I attended the PRP meeting in Chicago on June 9, 1988. I viewed the abstract listing PRP's alphabetically, and also viewed that limited portion of Martell's statement allegedly linking Multifoods to the sites. I also had a brief glimpse at Ms. Swales' printout, which indicated one invoice dated April 18, 1975. In a later telephone conversation with Ms. Swales, she indicated that no actual copy of said invoice apparently exists in your records. I have been unsuccessful in locating such an invoice in our company records, primarily due to the age of this transaction. We are, therefore, presented with Mr. Martell's statement, which is of very dubious accuracy, to the effect that certain "coconut oil waste" was dumped in some undetermined quantity during the time period which your office is concerned with, namely 1972-1975.

As you and I also discussed during our recent telephone conversation, there \underline{may} have been a disposal of a dilute solution derived from shredded coconut, with some coconut oil mixed in. The solution in question was the by-product of a process to isolate coconut fiber, which was used for the manufacturing of a fig-paste substitute for human consumption. The liquid which was the by-product of this process was originally intended to be hauled away to be used in the manufacture of soap. When it was later determined that there was too much water in the solution for it to be cost effective in the soap manufacturing process, our location then engaged the services of a contract hauler to remove the solution generated by the process. Such a mixture, even

US EPA RECORDS CENTER REGION 5

Mr. Edward Kowalski June 20, 1988 Page Two

if not used as a soap stock, as it was intended to be, would have been quickly degraded by the micro-organisms in the environment, into water and carbon dioxide. In addition, it was discovered that washed wheat bran was just as functional but far less costly. Accordingly, the aforementioned process was then accomplished using the bran, instead of coconut, as a key ingredient.

I am providing this information, as you suggested during our conversation, to aid you in your decision as to whether International Multifoods should be removed from the list of potentially responsible parties with regard to the above referenced sites. A dilute solution from the aforementioned process is not a hazardous substance and is biodegradable. I trust that I will receive your letter removing International Multifoods from the list of potentially responsible parties with regard to the above referenced sites, prior to the issuance of any special notice letter, which you stated was scheduled for the first week of July, 1988. I look forward to receiving that letter.

Very truly yours,

INTERNATIONAL MULTIFOODS 7

David L. Soucy

Manager, Corporate Safety & Loss Prevention

DLS/cst

delivered to and the dall postmester for fees and 1 Show to whom do show the delivery do show t	"RETURN TO" Space of to you. The return of delivery. For add theck box(es) for additivered, date, and active charge of the charg	on the reverse side, receipt fee will provide itional fees the following conservice(s) request essee's address. 4. Artic	desired, and complete ite desired, and complete ite desired de this will prever de you the name of the fing services are available. Cod. Restricted Delivery (Extra charge) Irvice: red Insured COD Mail COD Mail COD Mail COD CO	onsult 8
7. Date of Delivery PS Form 3811, Max	1987	PO. 1987-178-288	TO DOMESTIC RETUINED	N RECEIPT

; ___

The state of the second	47.14.34.34.34.34			
SENDER: Complete Items 1 and 2 when additional services are desired, and complete Items 3 and 4. Put your address in the "RETURN TO" Space on the reverse side. Failure to do this will prevent this card from being returned to you. The return receipt fee will provide you the name of the person delivered to and the date of delivery. For additional fees the following services are available. Consult postmester for fees and check box(es) for additional service(s) requested. 1. Show to whom delivered, date, and addressee's address. 2. D. Restricted Delivery. 1. Extra charge!				
3. Article Addressed to:	4. Article Number 759 199 497			
INTERNATIONAL MULTI FOODS PO BOX 2942 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402	Type of Service: Registered Insured Certified COD Express Mail			
	Always obtain signature of addressee or agent and DATE DELIVERED.			
5. Signature – Addressee X 6. Signature – Agent X	8. Addressee's Address (ONLY if requested and fee poid)			
7. Date of Delivery MAR 1 6 1988 PS Form 3811, Mar. 1987 U.S.G.P.O. 1987-178-268	29601 DOMESTIC RETURN RECEIPT			

موراهار الما